

### REMARKS

Claims 11-18 are pending in the application.

Claims 11-18 stand rejected.

Claims 11, 15 and 16 are independent

The Office Action rejects claims 11 and 13-18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Lancelot et al. (USP 6,026,086) (hereinafter "Lancelot") in view of Hamamoto et al. (USP 6,038,233) (hereinafter "Hamamoto"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

#### Claim 11

Claim 11 recites: "a first address translator for translating initial address information carried by packets received from at least one terminal device into address information carrying information about:

(a) the predetermined transmission properties to be used for transmitting the associated packets" (emphasis added).

It is admitted on page 2 of the Office Action that Lancelot fails to disclose the predetermined transmission properties to be used for transmitting packets.

The Office Action alleges Hamamoto discloses this feature at col. 1, lines 35-37. It appears the Office Action is relying on a QoS field as being equivalent to the claimed features (see Office Action top of page 3).

However, Hamamoto does not particularly discuss a QoS field only a service type in the header. However, the service type is not address information carrying information about: the predetermined transmission properties to be used for transmitting the associated packets.

Hamamoto appears to only disclose translating, for example, an IPv4 header to an IPv6 header. The header includes a version field, a service type field, a source address and a destination address among other fields.

Hamamoto describes converting the IPv4 address to an IPv6 address and converting the service type in the IPv4 header to a service type in the IPv6 header.

Thus Hamamoto is converting address to address and service type to service type. There is no disclosure or suggestion of converting an address to an address information carrying service type information. Nowhere does Hamamoto describe that

the service type information is address information or even related to address information. In Hamamoto the service type is a completely separate field than the address information.

In contrast to Hamamoto, applicant claims translating initial address information carried by packets received from at least one terminal device into address information carrying information about: the predetermined transmission properties to be used for transmitting the associated packets.

Thus, Hamamoto teaches converting address to address and service type to service type, while applicant claims translating initial address information into address information carrying information about: the predetermined transmission properties to be used for transmitting the associated packets. Hamamoto fails to teach or suggest applicant's claimed features.

Therefore, neither of Lancelot or Hamamoto teaches at least the above claimed features and, for at least the foregoing reasons, applicant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness according to MPEP 2142 has not been established and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that claim 11 is allowable.

Claims 13-14 and 17-18 depend upon allowable claim 11 and are also allowable at least by virtue of their dependency therefrom and because each claim further recites distinguishing features.

#### Claim 15

Claim 15 recites a "first address translation providing address information within the packet header designating the address of the destination node and predetermined transmission properties to be used for transmitting the associated packets."

The analysis of independent claim 15 is substantially analogous to the analysis of claim 11, as presented hereinabove. To avoid repetition, claim 15 will not be discussed in detail with the understanding that it is patentable at least for the same reasons as claim 11. Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 15 should be withdrawn.

Claim 16

Claim 16 recites a “communication method comprising ... translating initial address information carried by packets received from at least one terminal device into address information carrying information about the transmission properties to be used for transmission of the packets.”

The analysis of independent claim 16 is substantially analogous to the analysis of claim 11, as presented hereinabove. To avoid repetition, claim 16 will not be discussed in detail with the understanding that it is patentable at least for the same reasons as claim 11. Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 16 should be withdrawn.

Claim 12

The Office Action rejects claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Lancelot in view of Aramaki.

Since claim 12 depends from claim 11, applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 12 should be withdrawn as Lancelot fails to teach or suggest all the features of claim 11 as admitted in the Office Action. For Example, Lancelot fails to teach at least: “(a) the predetermined transmission properties to be used for transmitting the associated packets” (emphasis added).

Aramaki fails to cure this deficiency, therefore the combination of Lancelot in view of Aramaki fails to teach or suggest each claimed feature and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections of record and allowance of this application are solicited. Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney in order to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues. In the event that the fees submitted prove to be insufficient in connection with the filing of this paper, please

Serial No.: 10/780,473

charge our Deposit Account Number 50-0578 and please credit any excess fees to such Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 8, 2008

/Brian S. Myers/  
Brian S. Myers  
Registration No.: 46,947  
For Eric Bram,  
Registration No.: 37,285

**Mail all correspondence to:**

Eric Bram, Registration No.: 37,285  
US PHILIPS CORPORATION  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001  
Phone: (914)333-9635  
Fax: (914)332-0615